UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,353	05/31/2006	Uwe Hauf	2006-084	3626
27569 PAUL AND PA	7590 04/21/200 \U L	EXAMINER		
2000 MARKET	_	MACARTHUR, SYLVIA		
SUITE 2900 PHILADELPHI	IA, PA 19103	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1792	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@PAULANDPAUL.COM claire@paulandpaul.com fpanna@paulandpaul.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/581,353	HAUF ET AL.	
Examiner	A 4 1 14	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Sylvia R. MacArthur	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	021160				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	idoling of onlipinging th	10 100000 101				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
April 16, 2009	/Sylvia R MacArthur/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1792					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the prior art of Henington et al does not provide more than one conveying member however as stated in the last office action paragraph 5, Henington et al teaches rollers 20A,20B these rollers are interpreted as the conveying member. It is noted that the prior art of record fails to teach the location of the conveying members as recited, but applicant has failed to recite the criticality of the location. Applicant further argues that no motivation was provided to duplicate the conveying members to have more than one of either side of the conveying path is that more than one conveying member on the same side of the path allows for a plurality of substrates to be treated and/or transported which would in essence increase throughput. Applicant argues also insinuate that the carrier elements each have a plurality of recesses but this is not claimed.